

Fairfax Center Phase II Working Group

Meeting Minutes

February 9, 2016

Attendance

Working Group: Tony Wiley, Sherry Fisher, Jeff Parnes, Jeff Saxe, Robbie Stark

Staff: Kim Rybold (DPZ), Ken Sorenson (DPZ), Rosemary Ryan (Supervisor Cook's office – Braddock District), Laura Floyd (Supervisor Smith's office – Sully District)

Introduction

Jeff Saxe assumed the role of Chairman, and called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. He stated that the group would vote on the past meeting's minutes later in the evening, once more people were in attendance. Kim Rybold stated that the group would hear a couple of presentations on proposed Plan changes within the Suburban Center, and would then finalize land use scenarios to be tested by county staff.

Presentation: PA 2015-III-FC1 (Fair Lakes – Land Units G, H & I)

Frank McDermott, representing Peterson Companies, presented this Plan amendment, which is being considered separately from the Fairfax Center Area Study process. He stated the rezoning was originally approved in 1984. In 2007 and 2008, higher density uses were approved for the Fair Lakes area including residential, retail and office uses. These approvals were based upon site-specific development options added to the Comprehensive Plan in the mid-2000s. The proposed Plan Amendment does not add any additional development intensity, but would allow for the already approved intensity to be moved throughout Fair Lakes. He noted that the options in the Plan have a number of performance criteria to guide development, including high quality architectural design, mitigation of traffic impacts, buffering, and screening.

Robbie Stark asked if they have any specific projects in mind. Frank McDermott responded that they have missed other opportunities in the past, and would like to be able to respond more easily in the future. Jeff Parnes asked if the location of the planned transit station at Stringfellow Road and Interstate 66 factored into their planning. Frank McDermott noted that Fair Lakes is well located relative to transit, and that there is currently a shuttle service they operate to connect to the Vienna Metrorail Station. Jeff Parnes also expressed a concern that the movement of intensity could result in development that is outside of the previously envisioned nodes. Jeff Saxe said that the applicant would still have to go through the Proffer Condition Amendment process, so any proposal would be reviewed vigorously by staff in that process. Frank McDermott noted that they would have to meet the development criteria in order to do this.

Presentation: Parcel 35 (Warhurst-Williams Property)

Kim Rybold provided a brief background presentation on this property, which is located at the northwest corner of Lee Highway and Legato Road. This property is within Sub-unit 01, which is planned for residential use at 12 du/ac at the overlay level. To reach the overlay level density,

substantial consolidation was recommended, based on conditions laid out in the Comprehensive Plan. A majority of the sub-unit consolidated in the early 2000s, leaving this parcel able to develop at the intermediate level of development, residential use at 6 du/ac. Density within the consolidated portion of the sub-unit was concentrated along the northern edge, with townhouses generally comprising the southern portion of the sub-unit. Likewise, development of the consolidated area provided amenities such as a school site and open space, which were included in the overall measurement of density. Additional considerations for this site include connectivity to other portions of the Sub-unit, and the presence of Resource Protection Area on the western portion of the site.

Frank McDermott, representing the owner of the property, presented the proposed Plan change. He stated that the subject parcel was the original location of the Merrifield Garden Center, and was not consolidated with the development of the Dix-Cen-Gato parcels as the owners were still using this parcel for the business at the time. Residential use at 12 du/ac is requested, so that development can occur here in a manner similar to that which is to the north along Legato Road. This would also provide an incentive to redevelop the commercially-zoned portion of this parcel, in line with current Plan recommendations for Lee Highway.

Jeff Saxe asked if an RPA delineation had been completed. Frank McDermott noted that it is too early in the process for that step. Tony Wiley asked about the impact on schools, and which schools this development would feed into. Staff noted that this information would be provided as a part of the impact analysis.

Jeff Parnes asked what would be provided in the proffers, and if this development would be indistinguishable from that to the north. Frank McDermott stated that it would be in the same style as the existing development. Jeff Parnes also asked about citizen input, since access would be provided through the existing townhouses to the north. Frank McDermott noted that they have not reached out to the community yet, but they do have an existing access easement and there would not be a through road to Lee Highway.

Presentation: Submission SS2 (Pender Professional Center) – Revised Concepts

Aristotelis Chronis, attorney for Pender Professional Center, LLC, presented updates to the submission that was presented at the January Working Group meeting. He presented three updated options to the group that would consider redevelopment of the existing office building in addition to development on the vacant parcel. The first option was all residential development, consisting of 119 townhouses at an overall density of 6.6 du/ac. The second option consisted of 120 multifamily units with ground floor retail, 100 senior housing units, and 32 townhouse units on the northern portion of the property at an overall intensity of approximately .40 FAR. The third option consisted of 120 multifamily units with ground floor retail and 25 assisted living units at an overall intensity of approximately .30 FAR.

Jeff Parnes asked what the property owner's preference was of the options. Aristotelis Chronis stated that the townhouse option would be the easiest to implement. Jeff Parnes noted that he liked that option the least, as it seemed to be forcing too much residential use into one area. Jeff Saxe noted that the site is located between a retail center and an electric substation, and the access is not great. Tony Wiley noted that the location relative to the substation and the access is more of a

concern for the builder and potential residents. Jeff Parnes stated that senior housing or assisted living would have more shuttles and might make more sense on a site such as this. Jeff Saxe asked if retail was requested by the group at the last meeting, as it did not seem like ground floor retail would be successful on this site. The group responded that they did not, only asking for the property owner to think of a more long-term vision for the property.

Scenario Development Discussion

Kim Rybold distributed draft land use scenarios for the group's consideration based on the presentations and feedback from the last meeting. She noted that because staff just received the updated options for the Pender Professional Center that day, they were not able to integrate these into the draft scenarios. After some discussion, the Working Group voted to include two scenarios for the Pender Professional Center, an all-townhouse option at a maximum of 8 du/ac, and an option for 100 multifamily units and 125 senior housing/townhouse units. The group noted that 8 du/ac represented a maximum in line with the Comprehensive Plan's density ranges, but that it was likely for their recommendation to possibly be lower in density. The group also voted to include Tax Map Parcel 56-1 ((1)) 35 within the land use analysis at a maximum density of 12 du/ac. Other scenarios for the NRA property and the Fair Oaks Church were accepted as noted in the handout.

Minutes and Upcoming Meetings

Upon conclusion of the discussion, the Working Group approved the 1/12/2016 meeting minutes.

Kim Rybold stated that at the next meeting, the group would review of the areawide submissions and Plan guidance, and would begin to discuss the area's implementation strategies. Once the impact analysis is complete, staff will bring preliminary results back to the group.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.